

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

WILLIAM MAXWELL O/B/O	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-2410
GAIL A. MAXWELL-CLEMENTS,	:	
DECEASED,	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting	:	
Commissioner of Social Security,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 27th day of May, 2015, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 16) of Magistrate Judge Gerald B. Cohn, recommending the court dismiss the appeal (Doc. 1) of plaintiff William Maxwell, on behalf of Gail A. Clements-Maxwell, from the decision of the administrative law judge (“ALJ”) denying her application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, and, following an independent review of the record, the court being in full agreement with Judge Cohn that the ALJ’s decision is supported by substantial evidence, see 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (“The findings of the [Commissioner] as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.”); see also Fagnoli v. Massanari, 247 F.3d 34, 38 (3d Cir. 2001) (“Where . . . findings of fact are supported by substantial evidence, [the district court] is bound by those findings, even if [the court] would have decided the factual inquiry

differently.”), and the court noting that plaintiff filed objections¹ (Doc. 17) to the report, and the Commissioner of Social Security filed a response (Doc. 18), and the court finding Judge Cohn’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record, and the court further finding plaintiff’s objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by the report, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 16) of Magistrate Judge Cohn is ADOPTED.
2. Plaintiff’s appeal (Doc. 1) from the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is DISMISSED.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER

Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania

¹ When parties object to a magistrate judge’s report, the court performs a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). “In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires ‘written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.’” Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).